

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	:	Peter A. Hochstein	:
			:
Patentee	:	Relume Corporation	:
			:
Patent No.	:	5,661,645	:
Issued	:	August 26, 1997	: Group Art Unit: 2838
			:
Reissue Serial No.	:	09/382,702	:
Reissue Filed	:	August 24, 1999	: Examiner: B. Vu
			:
Attny No.	:	65,016-046	:
			:
Filed	:	August 24, 1999	:
			:
Title	:	POWER SUPPLY FOR LIGHT EMITTING DIODE ARRAY	:

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
UNDER 37 CFR 1.97 (2)(f)

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to Rule 97 and in compliance with Rule 56, Applicant hereby makes of record the items listed on the attached Form PTO-1449. A copy of the listed items noted on the PTO-1449 are enclosed. Applicant is submitting the IDS under the procedures set forth under 1.97(b)(4) as a matter of right.

As to the Third Declaration of Dr. Robert W. Erickson (cited reference *AC*) and the Supplemental Third Declaration of Dr. Robert W. Erickson (cited reference *AD*), applicant files herewith as cited reference *AE* a table comparing and correlating such declarations to previously considered Memoranda of LumiLeds. In short, it was and still is applicant's view that the enclosed declarations of Dr. Erickson (cited references *AC* and *AD*) are cumulative with respect to the consideration and citation to those declarations in the LumiLeds' memoranda previously brought to the Examiner's attention and considered by the Examiner. Specifically, the Memorandum of Law in Support of LumiLeds Lighting BV, Philips lighting BV and The Hewlett-Packard Company's Motion for Summary Judgement of Invalidity for Obviousness was previously identified as cited reference *AT* on page 9 of 24 of the IDS considered by the Examiner on March 8, 2000. Likewise, the Reply Brief in Support of LumiLeds Lighting BV,


Philips Lighting BV, and The Hewlett-Packard Company's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Obviousness was cited reference **AW** on page 10 of 24 of the IDS considered by the Examiner on March 8, 2000. For the convenience of the Examiner, additional copies of these memoranda are enclosed with this filing. Consistent with applicant's view that the Third and Supplemental Third Declarations of Erickson are cumulative with respect to the above identified memoranda, applicant submits herewith and identifies as cited reference **AE** an attorney prepared table correlating (in applicant's view) the Erickson declarations to the previously considered memoranda. In addition, applicant submits herewith an earlier original declaration of Dr. Erickson identified as cited reference **AB**. It is believed that the content of this document is also cumulative with respect to the second Erickson declaration previously considered by the Examiner as cited reference **AS** on page 8 of 10 of the PTO-1449 submitted with the IDS which was considered by the Examiner on **March 8, 2000**, later declarations of Erickson (cited references **AC** and **AD**) and the summary judgment memoranda considered hereinabove.

Applicant wishes to bring to the attention of the Examiner page 11 of the enclosed Special Master's Report (cited reference **AF**) which discusses the failure to previously submit the Third and Supplemental Third Erickson Declarations (enclosed cited references **AC** and **AD**). As considered above and in the enclosed cited referenced table **AE**, applicant is of the view that the declarations **AC** and **AD** are cumulative.

Applicant believes that no fee should be assessed. However, should the Commissioner deem it necessary to charge a fee the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 08-2789. A duplicate of this paper is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.

2/25/02
Date


Harold W. Milton, Registration No. 22,180
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite #101
39400 Woodward Avenue
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151
(248) 723-0352

Enclosures:

- Form PTO-1449 w/ 5 Cited References
- Additional Copy of Hewlett-Packard Company's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Obviousness
- Additional Copy of Reply Brief in Support of LumiLeds Lighting BV, Philips Lighting BV, and The Hewlett-Packard Company's Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity for Obviousness